

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. In the September 20, 2007 office action, the Examiner:

A. Rejected claims 1-6, 12-14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,982,234 to Fillion; and

B. Rejected claims 7-11, 15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fillion in view of Well Known Prior Art MPEP 2144.03.

In this response, claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 12 and 13 have been amended. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims and request reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

II. Claim Amendments

Claims 1 and 12 have been amended in a substantially similar manner. For example, each of claims 1 and 12 has been amended to include a limitation similar to the following: "inputting data into a document management system using the naming convention, the data corresponding to the identified pages." Similarly, claims 2, 3 and 6 have been amended to recite entering data corresponding to an imposition scheme (claim 2), a page designation (claim 3), and an even/odd designation for the page range indicated by the page numerals and range indicator (claim 6); and claim 13 has been amended to recite "an input window for entering data corresponding to the naming convention." Support for

this amendment may be found in the specification as filed on page 10.

III. The Rejection of Claims 1-20 Should Be Withdrawn

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Filion or under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filion. For the reasons discussed below, Filion does not teach, show or suggest each and every limitation of claims 1-20, as amended.

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by Filion. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation that the naming convention "inputting data into a document management system using the naming convention, the data corresponding to the identified pages." Thus, claim 1 requires that data, i.e. even/odd designations, page numeral designations, page range designations, etc., are input into the document management system to identify pages of the document.

Filion fails to disclose a naming convention "inputting data into a document management system using the naming convention, the data corresponding to the identified pages." For example, in the system described in Filion, in order to identify pages for grouping and exception processing, a user scrolls through the pages of the document using the scroll button 604 and selects pages or ranges of pages for grouping. In Filion, the user does not input data according to a naming convention into the system.

Accordingly, because Filion fails to disclose inputting data into a document management system using the naming convention, the data corresponding to the identified pages., it is respectfully submitted that the anticipation rejection of claim 1, as amended, should be withdrawn.

B. Claims 2-11

Claims 2-11 depend directly or indirectly from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, for the same reasons as those set forth above in connection with claim 1, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 2- should be withdrawn as well.

Moreover, claims 2-11 include additional reasons for patentability over the prior art. For example, claims 2-6 include limitations directed to entering data into the document management system such as an imposition scheme (claim 2), a page designation (claim 3), and an even/odd designation for the page range indicated by the page numerals and range indicator (claim 6). Claims 4 and 5 are directed to how the page numerals, as specified in claim 3, are entered. As mentioned above, Filion does not disclose entering information into the system. In Filion, pages of a document are selected and then the exception parameters for the selected pages are specified. Nothing is entered into the system in Filion. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, the rejection of claims 2-11 should be withdrawn as well.

C. Claim 12

Claim 12 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. In particular, claim 12 has been amended to include the limitation of “an exception page selector for identifying pages within a document with a naming convention and for inputting data corresponding to the identified pages using the naming convention.” Therefore, the arguments presented above in connection with claim 1 are applicable to claim 12, as amended. Accordingly, for at least those reasons given above in connection with claim 1, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 12, as amended, should be withdrawn as well.

D. Claims 13-20

Claims 13-20 depend directly or indirectly from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 12. Accordingly, for the same reasons as those set forth above in connection with claim 12, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 13-20 should be withdrawn as well.


Moreover, claims 13-20 include additional reasons for patentability over the prior art. For example, similar to claims 2-11, claim 13 includes further limitations regarding inputting data input into the system. Therefore, for these additional reasons, the rejection of claims 13-20 should be withdrawn as well.

IV. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit a patentable contribution to the art has been made. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

In the event applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for an extension of time or payment of an additional fee, the applicant conditionally petitions therefore, and authorizes any fee deficiency to be charged to deposit account number 24-0037.

Respectfully submitted,
MAGINOT, MOORE & BECK LLP



David R. Moorman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 59,323

December 20, 2007
Maginot, Moore & Beck LLP
Chase Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5109
(317) 638-2922 Telephone
(317) 638-2139 Facsimile